

June 23, 1995



Ms. Pat Vogtman, Project Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
77 West Jackson Blvd., HSM-5J
Chicago, IL 60604

RE: ARCS Contract No. 68-W8-0079
Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill (11-5LAN)
Contractor Work Assignment Completion Report

Telephone

616.942.9600

Facsimile

616.942.6499

Dear Pat:

We are pleased to submit the enclosed contractor Work Assignment Completion Report for the recently completed RI/FS at the Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill in Albion, Michigan.

As you know, this project was performed under the Agency's accelerated SACM program and was thus completed in an expeditious manner with a significant savings in cost. We wish to acknowledge that the RPMs that worked on this assignment were very instrumental to its success.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to perform this assignment. If you have any questions, please contact our office.

Very truly yours,

EARTH TECH
ARCS Program Management Office

Carl A. Malsom
ARCS Program Manager

cc: Ms. Brigitte Manzke, CO
Ms. Leah Evison, RPM, U.S. EPA
Reading File, 04011, 32

RECEIVED
JUN 26 1995

REMEDIAL & ENFORCEMENT
RESPONSE BRANCH

E A R T H



T E C H

CONTRACTOR WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)			
CONTRACT NO.: 68-W8-0079	WORK ASSIGNMENT NO.: 11-5LAN	EPA REGION 5	
CONTRACTOR/SUBCONTRACTOR(S) EARTH TECH (formerly WW Engineering & Science) 5555 Glenwood Hills Parkway, S.E. P.O. Box 874 Grand Rapids, MI 49588-0874		CONTRACTOR SITE MANAGER (Name and Phone No.) Elizabeth Bartz, (616) 940-4404 RPM (Name and Phone No.) Leah Evison, (312) 886-4696 WORK LOCATION (Site Name & State) Albion-Sheridan Township Landfill, Albion, Michigan	
BRIEFLY DESCRIBE SCOPE OF WORK: Implementation of a RI/FS at a municipal landfill in Albion, Michigan			
DESCRIBE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE: Overall performance is rated as "Outstanding" for this work assignment. During the six evaluation periods from November 1991 through October 1994, this assignment receive two "outstandings," three "exceeds expectations", and one "satisfactory" rating. Fifty-seven percent of the work was performed during the period of time rated as "outstanding," 37% performed during "exceeds expectations," and 6% was performed during the period of time rated as "satisfactory." These percentages were calculated from the total amount of \$ billed. The technical quality of the work was consistently reported to be of high caliber. EARTH TECH worked closely with the RPMs to interpret and implement the project in the spirit and intent of the SACM program against strong opposition from the State. LOE hour and dollar expenditures were closely tracked and several additional tasks were performed within the original budget. EARTH TECH proposed remedies that would meet the differing viewpoints of the State and Federal programs that would result in reduced remedial action costs.			
UNUSUAL PROBLEMS/OCCURRENCES AFFECTING CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE: No unusual problems/occurrences arose that affected the contractor's performance.			
PHASE I AVAILABLE \$16,487.90*	PHASE I PAID \$18,935.91	PHASE II AVAILABLE \$16,487.90	PHASE II AWARD RECOMMENDED? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES RECOMMENDED SIZE <u>100%</u> (0-100%) <input type="checkbox"/> NO
STATE SPECIFIC REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION FOR PHASE II AWARD: (Additional pages may be attached if necessary) EARTH TECH provided high quality technical products, close tracking of LOE hours and dollars, and excellent communications with the RPMs which enhanced the working relationship greatly.			
Site Project Manager <u>Elizabeth U. Bartz 6-14-95</u> Signature and Date		ARCS Program Manager <u>Carl A. Malson 6/23/95</u> Signature and Date	

* Based on an estimated total of 11,530 LOE hours at completion and Award Fee based on \$2.86 per LOE hour.

CONTRACTOR WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR) PART II: PROJECT SCHEDULE AND COST INFORMATION WORKSHEET					
CONTRACT NO.: 68-W8-0079		WORK ASSIGNMENT NO.: 11-5LAN		EPA REGION 5	
APPROVED WORK PLAN AND WA AMENDMENT DATES	LOE AND EXPENSE COSTS	SUBCON- TRACTING POOL COSTS	TOTAL PLANNED COSTS	PLANNED COMPLETION DATE	ACTUAL COMPLETION DATE
12/17/91 - Initial WAF for Work Planning	\$72,450	0	\$72,450	1/94	
4/9/92 - WAF Revision 1, Additional funding and pre-mobilization activities authorized.	61,064	0	61,065	1/94	
7/6/92 - WAF Revision 2, Work Plan approval	477,572	0	477,572	1/94	
8/14/92 - WAF Revision 3, Additional funding authorized.	590,002	0	590,002	10/94	
4/27/93 - WAF Revision 4, Additional work authorized (see TDM #1)	0	0	0	10/94	
11/10/93 - WAF Revision 5, Work Plan Revision	0	0	0	10/94	
6/1/94 - WAF Revision 6, SOW Revision for added task (test pitting)	0	0	0	10/94	
10/26/94 - WAF Revision 7, Additional work authorized	0	0	0	4/95	
3/23/95 - WAF Revision 8, Authorized WACR	0	0	0	4/95	
TOTAL PLANNED COST	\$1,201,088	0	\$1,201,088		
TOTAL ACTUAL COST *	916,000	0	916,000		
VARIANCE	\$285,088	0	\$285,088		

* Total estimated final cost without final fee payment.

CONTRACTOR WORK ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION REPORT (WACR)		
PART III: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA RATING WORKSHEET		
CONTRACT NO.: 68-W8-0079	WORK ASSIGNMENT NO. 11-5LAN	EPA REGION 5
PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	RATING	SUPPORTING COMMENTS
<u>PROJECT PLANNING:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ORGANIZING (E.G., WORK PLAN DEVELOPMENT, DATA REVIEW) SCHEDULING BUDGETING 	_____ 5 _____ <u>X</u> 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the assistance of the RPM and other U.S. EPA personnel, EARTH TECH assembled a work plan reflective of the SACM guidance for municipal landfill sites. The work plan was prepared to be very flexible to meet changing needs as they arose in the field. An ambitious schedule was submitted and a budget reflective of the flexible scope of work.
<u>TECHNICAL COMPETENCE & INNOVATION:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EFFECTIVENESS OF ANALYSES MEETING PLAN GOALS SUPPORT COE, STATE, ENFORC. ADHERE TO REGS. & PROCEDURES APPROACH CREATIVITY/INGENUITY EXPERT TESTIMONY 	_____ <u>X</u> 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent praise from the RPMs for strong technical expertise and presentation, innovative approaches to keep the project moving forward at a swift pace and a willingness to evaluate several approaches to satisfy strong opposition from the State.
<u>SCHEDULE & COST CONTROL:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BUDGET (HOURS & COST) MAINT. PRIORITY/SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENTS COST MINIMIZATION 	_____ <u>X</u> 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work was completed well under budget and several extra tasks were performed within the existing budget (additional geophysics work, installation of a septic tank, movement of fencing). EARTH TECH suggested innovative methods during the course of the project which resulted in cost savings. Nearly all the documents were submitted on time.
<u>REPORTING:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TIMELINESS OF DELIVERABLES CLARITY THOROUGHNESS 	_____ <u>X</u> 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality and timely monthly reporting. High technical quality of written reports with clear, concise graphics and tables, reduced the number of comments received.
<u>RESOURCE UTILIZATION:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAFFING SUBCONTRACTING EQUIPMENT, TRAVEL, ETC. 	_____ <u>X</u> 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent staffing throughout the project resulted in enhanced efficiency and quality. Several subcontracts were bid for this project and the total subcontracting cost was in excess of \$220,000. Of this, over \$130,000 was awarded to SDBEs and over \$80,000 to SBEs.
<u>EFFORT:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RESPONSIVENESS MOBILIZATION DAY-TO-DAY SPECIAL SITUATIONS (E.G., ADVERSE/DANGEROUS CONDITIONS) 	_____ <u>X</u> 5 _____ 4 _____ 3 _____ 2 _____ 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent praise from RPM for being extremely responsive to U.S. EPA's needs. EARTH TECH worked expeditiously to bid and award subcontracts to minimize delays to the project. Constant communication with the RPMs assisted in moving the project forward. EARTH TECH worked extremely hard to deal with a resident at the site who proved very difficult to satisfy. EARTH TECH adjusted work and schedule activities to accommodate the concerns of this resident.